

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

The Examiner rejected claims 1-5 and 26-47 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly obvious over Arlein in view of Vuoristo and further in view of Kondou. In response, base claims 1 and 33 have been amended. Claims 28, 29, 40, 41 and 45 have also been amended to properly reference the amended base claims.

The claimed invention is directed to a technique for communication of information to a mobile device. In accordance with the invention, profiles of a mobile device user are established, which are, e.g., a personal profile, business profile, vacation profile, etc. A user may utilize the device to send a request for information, which may include data indicative of a selected profile of the user and a location of the device determined by the device (e.g., GPS data). Based on the received data, a server collects the requested information from different sources, e.g., Internet sources. The requested information is then provided to the device, which includes information concerning at least one product or service provider (e.g., a restaurant, a gas station, etc.), selected in a vicinity of the location of the device and in accordance with the selected profile. In addition, data is provided for the device to indicate to the user the location of the product or service provider relative to (e.g., its distance and direction from) the location of the device. *See page 9, line 11 et seq.; page 14, line 12 et seq.* of the specification; and Figs. 4, 5 and 10.

Arlein discloses a technique for providing a user web-browsing experience at merchant's website based on a persona selected by a user. Vuoristo discloses a telecommunications system utilizing subscriber service profiles. In the Office Action, the Examiner attempted to read Vuoristo's subscriber service profile on the term "resource" in claims 1 and 33. When faced with the additional claim limitations "providing data for the communication device to indicate to the user a location of the at least one resource relative to the location of the communication device," the Examiner additionally cited Kondou, which discloses providing information, e.g., about gas stations, restaurants, parking areas, etc. between a current device location and a destination area. The Examiner postulated that it would have been obvious to "incorporate the

**Appln No. 09/910,510**  
**Amdt date September 4, 2007**  
**Reply to Office action of June 4, 2007**

teaching of Kondou ... in order to provide to the user the proper information on a real time basis." Applicants are at a loss as to how indicating to the user the location of Vuoristo's subscriber service profile (unlike a gas station, restaurant, parking area, etc. as in Kondou) relative to the location of the user's physical device is relevant to the user, let alone proper on a real time basis. As such, the Examiner's justification for the incorporation of the Kondou is specious.

Even assuming, *arguendo*, that the Examiner's incorporation of Kondou is proper, none of Arlein, Vuoristo and Kondou, individually or in combination, teaches or suggests, among others, providing "information concerning at least one product or service provider," which not only is "selected in a vicinity of the location of the communication device," but also "in accordance with the selected profile," as amended claim 1 now recites. Amended claim 33 includes similar recitations. As such, amended claims 1 and 33, together with their dependent claims, are patentable over Arlein in view of Vuoristo and Kondou.

Claims 48-100 have been added which are drawn to different aspects of the invention.

In view of the foregoing, each of claims 1-5 and 26-47, as amended, and claims 48-100, as added, is believed in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration of these claims is requested and allowance of the application is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,  
CHRISTIE, PARKER & HALE, LLP

By

  
Daniel M. Cavanagh  
Reg. No. 41,661  
626/795-9900

DMC/rmw

RMW IRV1108651.1\*-09/4/07 11:09 AM